

Comments on the Second Draft of the Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Guidelines

Jean Higaki <jhigaki@smcgov.org>

Mon 10/15/2018 6:40 PM

To: Pennebaker, Laura@CATC <Laura.Pennebaker@catc.ca.gov>;

Hello Laura,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review and comment on the Second Draft of the Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Guidelines. Please see C/CAG's comments below:

- Section 6 – Given that the MPOs and Caltrans are the only eligible applicants for the SCC program it would make sense that the plans should have some sort of written concurrence or sign off from Caltrans or the MPO's if they are not prepared by either of these agencies.
- Section 9.2 – In evaluating plans, CTC should be cognizant that all goals listed in 9.1 may not be appropriate for all projects and that the overall goal of the plan should not be to expect each project to contribute to every goal but rather that the collective implementation of the various projects contribute overall to the goals.
- Section 9.4 – We request that the following edits be made to the following section:

Existing Plan – For Cycle 2 of the program, agencies may use an existing multimodal plan that is consistent with the intent of these guidelines, ~~was prepared with a public input process,~~ utilizes the most recent planning assumptions available as determined by the agency and is able to demonstrate that the integrated plans, proposed projects, and modal components proposed in the plan included a public input process.

First, please note that C/CAG very much values and appreciates the need for transparency and public input in all public agency plan development. However, our concern is with what we consider redundant efforts that will add unnecessary costs and delays. The plans and studies that were integrated in the US 101 corridor plan had extensive public outreach and input processes associated with those individual planning efforts. The requirement to reopen a recently completed document to additional public input is unnecessary and places an undue burden on a plan that was completed just last year. Furthermore, several of the projects, such as the Caltrain Electrification and the US 101 Managed Lane Projects, have already completed or are in the process of completing the environmental phase, which included a robust public input process.

For these reasons C/CAG requests the modified language outlined above to recognize as compliant the significant public input processes that have already occurred on the modal components contained in the existing US 101 corridor plan.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jean Higaki, PE PMP
C/CAG Program Director
555 County Center, 5th floor
Redwood City, CA 94063-1665
phone: (650) 599-1462